Colusa County Board of Supervisors
Comments On
CalFed Bay-Delta Program
Programmatic EIS/EIR
June 23, 1998

The Colusa County Board of Supervisors has reviewed the Programmatic EIS/EIR prepared under the CalFed program. The Board appreciates the volume of work, and the time required to compile data under the several elements within the EIS/EIR, however, such a vast publication is certain to fall short in various areas based solely on its' scope of influence and the speed of its' completion. Considering the scope and length of the program report the time allotted to adequately review and comment on the document was too limited. Certainly there should be no rush to enact a program that will effect virtually every aspect of life in northern California, and other parts of the state.

The County of Colusa will be dramatically effected by any CalFed alternative because of its location in the Central Valley and its agricultural economic base. Colusa County is located seventy miles north of Sacramento in the heart of the Sacramento Valley. It is divided by the Sacramento River on the east and the Tehama Colusa Canal on the west. The Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District also overlaps Colusa County. It begins at the Glenn County line and extends south east of Williams serving the central northern section of Colusa County. The Colusa Basin Drain bisects the center of the county and drains over 1,000,000 acres in Glenn, Colusa, and Yolo Counties, and also supplies irrigation water for adjacent lands. Water from the river system, the Central Valley Project and groundwater sources is used in agricultural production, environmental enhancement, and municipal services. Within the boundaries of Colusa County there are 450,236 acres of farm ground, 23,000 acres of state and federal refuges, and twenty-one water and reclamation districts. The economic stability of Colusa County depends on an adequate, affordable, and reliable source of water.

In the spirit of local control and stakeholder input, the Colusa County Board of Supervisors is pleased to provide general comments related to the overall EIS/EIR followed by specific references to the common elements of the CalFed program:

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Restoration plans that have been characterized as the largest in the history of the world, must be conceptualized, developed, and managed locally. The top down approach to environmental issues does not take into consideration local, and historical cultural practices. Agency solutions are detrimental when developed without landowner and local government input at the planning and development stage.

- Habitat for species should be concentrated first on federal, and state lands. Only after this space is maximized for habitat and species protection should private lands be considered for species enhancement. CalFed plans for land acquisition are not compatible with the economic stability of Colusa County where a generous expanse of habitat already exists.

- The Colusa County Board concurs with the restoration solution principles as outlined, but suggests an additional principle be incorporated. Sound science is the key to successful eco-restoration plans. Only environmental programs based on sound science, and subject to peer review should be implemented. Historical land use, local conditions, and cultural practices supported by landowners and local governments must be embodied in the solution principles. Wide scale changes in local practices cannot be based on assumptions, or incomplete data. Terms in the EIS/EIR such as *may,* or *could* suggest that the methodology presented is based on a series of assumptions and not on proven technologies or methods.

- The aims of environmental restoration must be realistic, and reflect reasonable goals. Plans and programs developed at the agency level are absent actual on ground experience, and have limited value in the field. Local citizens are the best administrators representing a vast repository of valuable knowledge, and practical skills attained through years of living on the land that CalFed seeks to reconstruct.

- Recommendations that use terms such as *cooperatively managed, protect,* and *species richness* are vague. Landowners cannot be expected to support any terminology with no clearly defined meaning, or impact. The logical interpretation of these terms implies that agencies and/or environmental interests will be partners in the management of private property. The intrusion of government into the day-to-day management of private industry is unacceptable.

- Some elements of the EIS/EIR conflict with current environmental policies on a national and statewide basis. Suggestions that call for the reduction of fuel loads in forests are in conflict with ESA requirements to protect species. California regulations have restricted rice farmers in numerous ways, i.e. burning, pesticide and herbicide use, and water diversions. This has resulted in the reduction of ground planted to rice, and reduced yields in fields that remain in rice production. However, CalFed calls for the increase of rice acreage for use as seasonal wetlands. CalFed's recommendations must take into consideration the effect of current legislation on real farming, and market practices.

- Governor Wilson recently stated in an article in the Sacramento Bee that "California act now to secure it's water future." A secure long-term water future for all the citizens of California will only be possible through the development of new water supply in the form of additional off-stream storage and reservoirs. Short-term environmentally correct fixes will not meet the needs of a growing population that increased by 600,000 in the last year. The Colusa County Board strongly supports additional storage facilities both north and south of the Delta. Additionally, it is extremely unlikely that the Board will support a final alternative that does not include the construction of off-stream storage in the north state. The construction of off-stream storage in the north state is simply mitigation for the water that will be diverted from the north to the south. All California citizens should share payment for storage facilities since the benefits of increased water supply and improved water quality are public advantages of the same magnitude as ecological restoration and conveyance.

- Area of Origin is of key importance to the citizens of the north state. Legally binding assurances regarding Area of Origin must be part of the CalFed document.

- Even though CalFed has federal, and state funding it cannot be expected to meet the funding requirements of all the proposed actions. Since resources are limited funding should be targeted on projects, such as off-stream storage that accrue the most general, and long lasting benefits. Ultimately, it will be the storage component of CalFed that will meet the demands of an ever-growing population.

COMMON ELEMENTS

General Assurances

- All three CalFed alternatives are based upon the development of a consensus assurance package. The Phase II Interim Report, March 1998, states that, "Before CalFed can move forward with any preferred program alternative, the CalFed agencies, and the many stakeholder communities must develop a consensus on an assurances package." However, assurances as defined by CalFed are meant to insure the implementation and agreed operation of the alternatives. These will include funding, regulatory, contractual, and institutional changes. The people of the north state refer to assurances as legally binding documents assuring that Area of Origin, and other local water rights are honored during this process. A reliable, and adequate water supply with attendant water rights is critical to the ongoing economic, and environmental health of rural counties, now and in the future. These water rights and promises must be upheld in the form of legally binding assurances.

Ecosystem Restoration Component

- Restoring salmon habitat in streams that do not have historical year round flows is not practical. Program emphasis should be placed on realistic restoration efforts. Beginning the restoration process in the main channel of rivers, and then moving to the streams is more logical. If rivers cannot support adequate fish numbers, then there is no justifiable reason to artificially boost the salmon population in streams.

- Stony Creek is critical to the water supply of the Tehama Colusa Canal and Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District, which are both partially located in Colusa County. Converting this seasonal creek into year round salmon habitat would limit the water supply capabilities of both districts. The Tehama Colusa Canal is already restrained by the operation of the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, and further restrictions would severely impact the water supply to districts associated with the canal.

- The Colusa Basin Drain has been identified as a component in the Colusa Basin Ecological Unit. CalFed references thermal impacts from the Drain during rice field de-watering in the fall, and the Drains' potential to draw salmon from their natural migration channel. The Colusa Basin Drain should not be treated as a tributary, and marked for restoration. The Drain is man-made, and was never intended to support salmon populations. The issue of warmer water returning to the Sacramento River at the Knights Landing "outfall" gates was addressed in the original SB 1086 Fisheries Report, and was ranked as the lowest action item. Controlling the water temperature in the Drain will require massive amounts of water. Where will the water come from, and who will pay for it?

- Livestock grazing is important to Colusa County. Recent studies conducted in Montana and Wyoming conclude that grazing along waterways is beneficial to both livestock, and the water resource. Sound science must precede any grazing restrictions since grazing adaptations will impact the economic base of Colusa County.

- CalFed suggests key actions for "protecting and managing" 2,000 acres of seasonal wetlands, "cooperatively manage" 26,435 acres of existing public and private seasonal wetlands, and "cooperatively manage" 111,000 acres of agricultural lands. Currently, Colusa County has 23,000 acres of wetlands in three refuges and thousands more acres of seasonal wetlands in the form of rice fields. Colusa County continues to subsidize state and federal property holdings to the detriment of its citizens through the Refuge Sharing Act tax status granted to such properties. Will the financial burden of federal and state ownership of property increase in Colusa County?

- The number of acres targeted by CalFed for restoration is consistent with the Joint Venture Habitat Agreement; a Memorandum of Understanding signed by a number of state and federal agencies, and environmental interests. Local counties were not involved in the development of the MOU and yet, plans are going forward without the consent of local counties, or local citizens. Consultation on a local level is a necessary step BEFORE implementation.

- The suggestion that lands within Colusa County be subjected to "periodic flooding and overland flow from river flood plains" is alarming. It appears that CalFed endorses a plan where by the Sacramento River would be allowed to meander over the lands in Colusa County. The Colusa County Board has grave concerns regarding meander zones. A Sacramento River meander study conducted by the SB 1086 riparian subcommittee included areas north of the Glenn-Colusa county line, and cited virtually no changes to the river course through Colusa County. Is the CalFed plan compatible with SB 1086? Additionally, the eastside of Colusa County is already included in the Sacramento River flood control and weir system. Is the CalFed meander plan compatible with existing flood control systems and infrastructures? Colusa County has experienced the devastation of natural and man-made floods, and cannot afford to become the victim of an experiment with meander zones.

- Protecting and maintaining riparian and shaded riverine habitat is appropriate when landowners and local governments are involved from conception to planning and strategy; however, Colusa County will not support the loss of more agricultural acreage, and tax base.

- CalFed offers no definition for what constitutes a slough or channel. Maintaining riparian vegetation along water conveyance systems is not practical and adds to the flooding potential within Colusa County since such a plan does not meet the standard operation practices for water delivery and drainage. These systems were not designed to be wildlife habitat, and if managed for habitat will effect the efficiency of water delivery systems. In addition, it has been our experience that habitat development, and the maintenance of levees in conjunction with flood control are in direct conflict. How does CalFed plan to make them compatible?

- Local experience has shown that improving habitat adjacent to agricultural lands has increased predation on adjacent crops. Who will pay for predation losses? What assurances will CalFed give to local landowners who border habitat areas?

C-013180

- CalFed suggests a programmatic action of deferring fall tillage on rice fields, and leaving rice in the fields to support wildlife. These actions do not reflect real life concerns, and issues faced by Colusa County farmers.

- CalFed recommends the development of "brood ponds." Additional brood ponds, while beneficial in areas where there are few wetlands, are not of significant value in areas like Colusa County where wetlands are abundant.

- The restoration element calls for a reduction of contaminants in the river system. The goal of contaminant reduction is beneficial, but contaminant studies must be based on sound science not assumptions, and be evaluated by a peer review panel. Objective and accurate data is crucial to agriculture, and the livestock industry in particular.

- The restoration element targets the giant garter snake, a federally listed threatened species. It suggests restoring habitat throughout the Colusa Basin Ecological Zone while also stating that the Colusa National Wildlife Refuge harbors the highest concentration of giant garter snakes in the Central Valley. Restoration of additional garter snake habitat in Colusa County will further reduce productive agricultural acreage.

- Maintaining fish friendly average daily temperatures in the Sacramento River and several creeks during the spring and fall months would require large releases of colder water from Shasta Dam and Black Butte Reservoir. Flows in the months of March, April, and May are targeted for increased cfs ranges. These proposals would impact the water supply available for irrigation of crops that are essential to the economic stability of Colusa County.

- CalFed proposes the retirement of vast numbers of agricultural acres. The impacts of land retirement on local communities were forecasted by the drought of the 1980's. The viability of county governments would be in jeopardy. The Colusa County Board cannot accept further reduction of productive ag ground by state, and federal agency action.

Water Quality Component

- The Comprehensive Monitoring, Assessment, and Research Plan (CMARP) is an important component in understanding water quality. These monitoring programs must be locally developed and managed, thus assuring local stakeholders that sound scientific standardized methodologies are implemented to assure fair and comprehensive results. An outside peer review should evaluate the process to assure that sound scientific principles, and techniques are followed. CalFed should fund this program.

- Current practices cannot be thrown out on a wholesale basis until viable alternative products and methodologies are identified. Incentives are recommended over punitive actions. A cooperative approach that is landowner, and local government based must be used to resolve these issues.

- Specifics of the program for data gathering techniques as well as for resolving conflicts must be identified. Landowner input will be a key element to the success or failure of such programs. Therefore, it is recommended that landowners and local governments should be the driving force in developing the data monitoring methodologies.

- Out of 236 organizations in the CalFed Water Quality Technical Group only six represented northern California landowners or 3%, agencies represented 75 of 236, or 32%, and environmental groups represented 19 of 236, or 8% of the total group. Northern California interests were under represented. Since most of the water comes from northern California, we need equal representation on CalFed water quality issues.

Watershed Component

- The watershed component of the CalFed Program has been added at the last minute. Only in the last five months have watersheds surfaced as an important element in the CalFed process. Further development of this infant component must include local input and control.

- Private landowners and local governments must be at the foundational level of all watershed plans and programs. Without private landowner cooperation no watershed program will be successful. Successful programs should be developed, and managed locally, and reflect local needs. The top down approach will result in failure, and additional resentment of government. We support less government intrusion into private property.

- No new agencies or authorities need to be developed to assist in watershed management. Local county government in conjunction with landowners are the best suited to act as their own watershed steering committees. Agency expertise should be used in an advisory capacity only at the request of local steering committees. This process must not be a top down approach. Often plans and actions are developed by agencies and environmentalists who do not have a real understanding of local land use policies and practices, and because they do not have to live with decisions, they recommend practices that are not realistic. Assuring that the process is landowner and local government driven will provide realistic, workable solutions to environmental issues.

- Identifying watershed projects will be relatively easy. The difficult part will be to identify the funding to implement such projects. Who will pay for these projects, and how will watershed projects is prioritized? How will each watershed receive fair funding share, and who will determine this? Will county governments be funded as active participants in the process? Currently local rural governments do not have the funds, or staffing available to participate in watershed activities.

Water Use Efficiency Component

- According to CalFed, the California Constitution (Article X, Section 2) prohibits "waste or unreasonable use of water and excludes from water rights any water that is not reasonably required for beneficial use." However, the Water Use Efficiency component does not define reasonable use, leaving the interpretation open. What is considered reasonable and efficient use will vary depending on the area of California attempting to define the terms.

- The Water Use Efficiency component calls for the "efficient use of developed water supplies." Efficiency is an admirable goal, but control should remain at the local level. The efficiency component cites current agricultural water use efficiency at a 73% level and calls for an increase to 85% by the year 2020[1] assuming that 520,000-acre feet of water will be freed up by the recommended water efficiency methods.[2] On-farm and water district irrigators are defined as inexperienced,[3] and CalFed recommends that farmers hire irrigation efficiency professionals[4] adding $7.80 per acre to existing production costs according to CalFed estimates.[5] The Board has serious concerns about water efficiency goals that would dictate cropping patterns in the Colusa County area. The choices open to local farmers regarding what they plant, and where they plant it is a matter of self-determination, and government must not intrude.

- The Water Use Efficiency component recommends the use of horizontal axis washing machines, low flow toilets and showerheads, and adjustments to landscape water needs, thus extending the CalFed influence into local front yards, laundry rooms, and bathrooms graphically exposing the over-reach of the entire CalFed plan.

- The efficiency component defines efficient water use as "characterized by the implementation of local water management actions that increase the achievement of CalFed goals and objectives." CalFed refers repeatedly to local control, and yet according to the efficiency component, ag water users "must demonstrate appropriate water management and planning is being carried out, and cost effective efficiency measures are being implemented in order to receive new water, participate in water transfers, and receive water from the drought water bank." Agricultural water users must meet the above criteria and receive endorsement from the Ag Water Management Council. According to the Water Use Efficiency component, "If an acceptable majority" of ag water suppliers have not prepared, adopted, received Council endorsement, and begun implementation of their ag water management plans by January 1, 1999, then "legislative and regulatory mechanisms will be triggered." Further, CalFed calls for investigation by the State Water Resources Control Board of waste and unreasonable use violations.[6] The Ag Water Management Council was created by passage of AB3616, but operates under a Memorandum of Understanding. CalFed has elevated the role of the Council to a regulatory status. What happened to local control?

- The efficiency component poses 13 questions about water marketing, but provides no answers.[7] Transfers, water marketing, and groundwater are given less detailed analysis in the Water Use Efficiency component raising many questions that CalFed does not resolve within the component. This is a perfect example of the rush to implement the CalFed plan without appropriate study. These questions need to be answered prior to moving forward with the CalFed plan.

---

[1] Tech Appendix 4-2, 4-9, 4-10
[2] Tech Appendix 4-25
[3] Tech Appendix 4-49
[4] Tech Appendix 4-6
[5] Tech Appendix 4-49
[6] General Assurances 2-6; 2-13
[7] Tech Appendix 7-4

- The component recognizes problems in groundwater transfers including subsidence, social and economic impacts, and suggests a number of ways to mitigate local losses. CalFed should be aware that local counties have passed groundwater and transfer ordinances that need to be recognized. Counties and water districts have also adopted AB3030 plans that cover groundwater management and transfer issues. Control should stay at the local level.

- The Water Use Efficiency component proposes the establishment of a "clearinghouse" to analyze the benefits and impacts of transfers. This creates another agency middleman, adding to existing governmental red tape, and siphoning funds from other areas of CalFed, and local entities.[8]

- While efficient use of water is obviously laudable, it must never undermine the viability of agricultural soil within the county. It is generally understood that a certain amount of water flowing over the soil is necessary to maintain its quality by preventing the build up of salts, and other undesirable minerals. The loss of water due to efficiency measures dictated by the CalFed Program could jeopardize the economic, and environmental stability of Colusa County.

VARIABLE ELEMENTS

Storage

Storage is usually referred to in the form of surface storage reservoirs and groundwater basins. According to CalFed documents, storage may, or may not be included in the Cal Fed alternatives. Surface storage provides not only an increase in water supply, but has added benefits to flood control, power generation and regulation, recreation, and the environment. Currently, there are over 30 major reservoirs within the Sacramento-San Joaquin system with a combined gross capacity of over 25 MAF.

Groundwater banking and conjunctive use are considered as additional viable options for storing water. Under these programs surface water is diverted for agriculture, or urban use during wet years which allows the aquifer to recharge, and then during dry years water is extracted from ground storage to meet these needs, and surface water is transferred. CalFed has identified 250 TAF of groundwater in the Sacramento Valley, and 500 TAF in the San Joaquin Valley as target volumes for the CalFed process.

Conjunctive use and water storage relates directly to water transfers. Currently the size of the Colusa Basin aquifer, and the quantity and quality of groundwater resources in the Sacramento Valley has not been determined. While local efforts are attempting to determine the viability of conjunctive use through 3030 plans, and water ordinances are being implemented to protect groundwater, large and long term water transfers should not be viewed as the solution to water deficiencies in other parts of the State.

Water transfers that rely on conjunctive use can adversely affect rural source areas in many ways. Agriculture in the source/supply areas of the transferred water may suffer due to a lowering of the water table and subsidence. Local economies and the social well being of rural citizens may suffer due to changes in income and employment. The rural environment will be severely impacted if the aquifers are over drafted. Prior to implementation of conjunctive use programs

[8] Tech Appendix 7-16

thorough local studies must determine the amount, and recharge ability of local aquifers. Any state, or federal conjunctive use programs must comply with local groundwater ordinances.

While some areas in the north state are flush with groundwater Colusa County has virtually no groundwater on the west side of the County and the east side is already demonstrating water quality degradation due to salts, therefore Colusa County's ability to contribute to conjunctive use programs is extremely limited. Additional concerns relating to land subsidence must be addressed as surface water delivery systems, and flood control systems are dependent upon stable ground surface levels.

Water storage is imperative to the long-term health and economic well being of northern California. While CalFed maintains that its purpose is to solve the problems in the Delta, the goal should be redefined to solving the States' water supply problem. Until this issue is addressed there will be no long-term fix to the Delta. Since the northern part of the State will shoulder the burden of supplying California's water, CalFed must not be limited in its review process of the real problem, the ever increasing need for water related to population growth. The only solution is multiple off-stream storage facilities both north and south of the Delta.

The goal of CalFed should be to make each region in California self-sufficient in regard to water demand and supply. While off-stream storage is foundational to a statewide solution, and it offers many benefits, off-stream storage facility site areas such as Sites/Colusa Reservoir project in Colusa County will be negatively impacted in the following ways:

- Conversion of dryland farm ground and grazing acreage
- Reduction of crop revenue and tax base due to conversions
- Possible conflict with the Williamson Act, and other local land use plans and policies
- Loss of ag jobs
- Environmental assessments on private property and related "Takings" issues

These negative impacts may be offset in part by:

- Recreational benefits
- Dry year alternative water supply
- Local water supply from reservoir projects
- Flood control benefits

Therefore, not only the extraction of northern California water, but also the housing of off-stream facilities should be mitigated. The beneficiaries of this water, the environment, and populations south of Sacramento, should share the cost of these projects. This is in keeping with the CalFed recommendation that users should pay their full share. If it were not for the increased demand from the south and the reallocation of water to the environment such facilities would not be necessary. Remember the north state did not cause the problems in the Delta.

In regard to staging, it is the feeling of the Board that all reservoirs be constructed prior to conveyance thus giving the citizens of the north state the necessary assurances that the north state will not be drained to benefit the south.

Conveyance

The conveyance element of the CalFed program describes various alternatives to move water through the Delta to export to southern California. As the population grows so will the demand for water through the Delta. Currently the State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project (CVP) have an export capacity of 15,000 cfs. The U.S. Corps of Engineers limits exports through the SWP to 6,680 cfs except during winter months. The CVP has a capacity of 4,600 cfs.

CalFed has identified three alternatives as viable options:

- **Alternative I: Existing System Conveyance**. Delta channels would remain the same, but some selected channel improvements in the southern Delta together with flow and stage barriers would allow increased pumping to full physical capacity of the SWP to 10,300 cfs.

- **Alternative II: Modified through Delta Conveyance**. Improvements north and south of the Delta channels, and widening of channel configurations.

- **Alternative III: Duel Delta Conveyance**. Combination of modified Delta Channels, and a new canal or pipeline connecting the Sacramento River with the export facilities at the SWP and CVP. The expected capacity of this new conveyance facility is in the 5,000 cfs to 15,000 cfs. The new facility would place a siphon under all waterways and infrastructures to minimize aquatic, and human disturbance.

CalFed appears to be supporting the third alternative, Duel Delta Conveyance, as the preferred alternative. While this alternative may be best for southern California interests it raises some key concerns for northern California. They are as follows:

- The screening facility will require a screen to meet 15,000 cfs. No facility exists today that meets these criteria. There is no proven track record for a screen this large.

- The proposed screen facility cannot screen for the vulnerable stages of fish species, such as striped bass, and thus will relocate fish mortality from south Delta diversions to the Sacramento River. Historically, northern California has suffered severe consequences for violations of the ESA such as at GCID, and the TC Canal. Northern California should not be held accountable for fish losses related to an isolated facility.

- Shipping 15,000 cfs through the canal will route water away from the Delta that would normally have been used for fish passage, and water flow circulation. While it supports fisheries, it will require more water for the flushing flows necessary to maintain water quality in, and through the Delta.

- Prior to implementing the preferred alternative all eighteen distinguishing characteristics mentioned on page 79-80 of the Phase II Interim Report need to be addressed.

- "An open channel is recommended over a pipeline because the two appear to have similar degrees of environmental impacts, and a pipeline will not significantly improve insurance against future increases in diversion capacity."[9] Additionally, the proposed canal will be 44 miles long and "consist of a trapezoidal section with gentle side slopes and a top width of

[9] Phase II, Inter m Report, pg. 99

around 600 feet and a depth of 27 feet. The pipeline facility would consist of side-by-side buried concrete pipelines."[10] The capacity of a pipeline is restricted to the circumference of the pipe, and the operating criteria, while the capacity of a canal can fluctuate, and can be raised to increase capacity, or built to plan for additional capacity in the future. The larger a canal is the more potential carrying capacity. It is evident that an open canal is not only cheaper to build, and operate, but can also be easily expanded for increased capacity.

- No limit has been set on the total amount of water to be exported to the south. A cap on water exports needs to be set for the protection of the Delta and northern California. An open canal lends itself to expanded exports. How much water will be transferred from northern California? Is there a cap? What indicators will trigger a decision that exports have exceeded their limits?

- "There are relatively minor differences in the acres of land use changes required among the alternatives. Ecosystem restoration will require up to 200,000 acres of change in each alternative. Some of this is already in government ownership, but most is agricultural land in private ownership. Levee changes could require up to 35,000 acres in each alternative. Water quality actions could affect approximately 40,000 acres. Storage could affect approximately 60,000 acres in each alternative. Conveyance could impact approximately 5,000 acres more land in Alternative 3 than Alternatives 1 and 2."[11] How much of this land will be located in Colusa County?

- While Alternative III may be the preferred alternative, a recommended "staging" implementation format is being discussed. Current discussions are focusing on trigger mechanisms that set a goal, and once accomplished this goal triggers the next stage in the implementation process. This staging concept is an incremental approach to the decision making process. While appropriate in some arenas, i.e.: environmental restoration, it leaves some stakeholders holding the bag when it comes to essential components such as guarantees for storage. It is of paramount importance that no conveyance facility be constructed prior to storage in the north state. Instead of a staging format, we recommend a coupling format whereby one project is linked directly to another. Storage should be linked to conveyance. This assures all interested parties that each entity gets what they need, and they move forward together.

- Transferring more water south will only feed the ever-increasing need, and insatiable appetite for water. CalFed, while attempting to address the water requirements of today, is overlooking the ever-increasing needs of tomorrow. Population growth will be the major contributor to increased water demands in the future. CalFed needs to address this issue if California is to reach a true balance of supply.

- Funding is of primary concern. The current funding proposal suggests that the user or the beneficiary pay for the associated facility. Since northern California did not cause the problems in the Delta, northern Californians should not bear the entire cost for storage, or pay in the form of a transfer water tax.

[10] Phase II, Inter m Report, pg. 100
[11] Phase II, Inter m Report, pg. 109

CONCLUSION

CalFed will be one of the most intrusive government programs addressed by rural counties during the next century. The interests of rural counties need to be fully represented during the process, as most of the targeted actions directly effect the people and lands within these counties. While the Colusa County Board of Supervisors supports the recovery of the Delta, we do not want a disproportionate share of the burden placed on agriculture, local governments, and private landowners.

Representatives of CalFed have made verbal claims that CalFed is a voluntary program. However, in reading the details of the draft, recommendations of legislative and regulatory actions surface. The assertion by CalFed of local control and local involvement is undermined by the punitive actions described in the EIS/EIR, proving that "voluntary and consensus" generally leads to mandatory compliance. Citizens within rural counties have experienced this incremental approach where voluntary programs eventually become mandatory programs, i.e. the first no burn days for rice. Consensus is encouraged, but programs must remain voluntary. The strong arm of government even now heavily regulates citizens within rural counties, and incrementalism opens the door to expanded government.

Rural governments need legally binding assurances that Area of Origin and water rights will be upheld and supported, and that the programs implemented will be cooperative in nature, administered by local people and fully funded by CalFed; that private property rights be upheld as set forth in the Constitution of the United States; that programs are realistic and based in sound science; that new agencies will not be created but rather existing agencies will be held accountable for their actions and expenditures; that any discussions of "staging" of programs and projects include the involvement of the local counties where the projects will be implemented; that all mandated costs to local counties related to implementing the CalFed programs are reimbursed; and finally, that the selected alternatives to "fix" the Delta are not carried out at the expense of northern California.

C-013188

COUNTY OF COLUSA
COLUSA, CALIFORNIA
95932-2492

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COLUSA CALIF. JUN 29'98 PB METER 4946745 U.S.POSTAGE 0.78

MR. LESTER SNOW
CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM
1416 9th STREET, SUITE 1155
SACRAMENTO, CA. 95814

JUN 30 1998

98 JUN 30 AM 10:53 DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES SACRAMENTO

95814/5503

C-013189

C—013189